

**Minutes of Meeting
December 6, 2010**

I. Chair's Announcements

Phokion Kolaitis, UCORP Chair

- Academic Council of November 22, 2010:

UPDATE: The Council has extended the MRU/Compendium revision due date to March 31, 2011. The Council also passed three resolutions: 1) the first endorsed President Yudof's PEB recommendations with a 7% "continuation cost cap" for continuing in UCRP status quo ante; 2) the second encouraged the administration to borrow as much of the UCRP ARC as possible from STIP; 3) the third is designed to codify CCGA's role, and thereby the Senate's role, in evaluating requests to increase fees for professional degree programs. As nothing is certain about the state's finances, mid-year cuts to UC remain a distinct possibility.

- Academic Assembly of December 1, 2010:

With Dan Simmons, Academic Council Chair

UPDATE: The annual reports of the standing committees were approved by the Assembly. The Council resolution on allocating faculty salary increase monies was referred back to the Council for further development; the intersection between the salary scales, merit, and off-scale awards remains the primary sticking point.

II. Consent Calendar

- Proposed Amendments to APM 010 and 015

ACTION: The draft was approved as noticed.

III. Systemwide Review Items

- Report and Recommendations of the Task Force on Senate Membership

Note: Item deferred.

- Review of Policy on Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs

ISSUE: In the past 15 years, 40 new programs have been established, but only 9 are part-time. Considerations include: the acceptability of masters-level only degrees, joint doctorates that are not PhDs, and the locus of fee determinations.

DISCUSSION: Members were unsure of the motives underlying the proposal: Shifting to self-supporting would allow programs to charge more than state-supported programs, and could lead UC further toward privatization. Other members wondered how faculty workloads would be affected, and whether research would again be asked to take a back seat to other considerations. Still other members speculated that the motive behind the changes was the expanding accreditation of many allied health fields, such as was recently seen during the

audiology degree establishment. Whether it is within UC's purview to educate allied health professionals toward non-research related degrees, however, is still the subject of much debate. Members also speculated that this might be another end-run effort by advocates of expanding online education at the expense of meaningful mentor interaction and closely supervised research activities.

Members suggested adding a UCORP review, not just a CCGA review, for programs that would clearly impact research. The authority of UC's Cooperative Extension to set fees for self-supporting graduate programs that it administers was also questioned.

ACTION: A letter will be drafted and circulated for approval at the January UCORP meeting.

IV. Consultation with External Relations

Lynn Tierney, Associate Vice President, Communications

Jason Simon, Director of Marketing and Communication Services

Andy Evangelista, Research Communications Coordinator

ISSUE: AVP Tierney stated that the goal of her unit is to discuss the University's goals in a way that is meaningful to decision makers, not necessarily just to the general public. Market studies indicate that to achieve the goal of increased state support for UC, for example, a public education campaign is ineffective. Further, the External Relations unit has reorganized itself to better enact this strategy and has conducted extensive focus group research and one-on-one interviews to facilitate realizing these goals.

DISCUSSION: Members noted that California's geographic distance from Washington DC might hamper efforts to increase the Facilities and Administration reimbursement rates, for instance. AVP Tierney agreed, but added that a new head for federal government relations was being recruited. Members inquired how big the DC office is, and were told it consists of 10-15 people.

Members then asked who the decision makers were, aside from legislators. AVP Tierney indicated that corporate donors and lobbyists were likely to be considered influencers within this rubric and strategy. Moreover, UC is cooperating with the CSU system on more statewide polling efforts to determine the likely limits of electoral support for higher education funding efforts. Director Simon noted the irony of UC's position: the University is a victim of its success insofar as we have weathered the storm so far, others think we need no external help.

Another obstacle facing University messaging is that education is considered a private responsibility while the benefits of UC research are considered public goods, and it takes a multi-stage, long-term communications effort to illustrate the benefit of investments in UC to the state and the public. Members asked how the economic benefit of UC-related start-ups was being packaged for the public, but no economic impact study has been conducted since 2003. In part, this omission is due to the labor-intensive nature of such studies. Members suggested, however, that the "value of research" can be presented in more than stark economic terms. AVP Tierney concurred, adding that the state's changing demographics also augur changes to the message and the medium.

Audience tensions further impact UC's messaging efforts: narrow self-selection into online media outlets must be balanced with successful face-to-face networking done

by agricultural extension specialists, for example. Members echoed a previously mentioned tension: much of the public agree that UC is good, but somehow distant from them. Finally, members suggested that the public faces of UC should routinely and explicitly make the case for supporting basic science and humanistic inquiry as independent goods.

V. Consultation with the Office of Research and Graduate Studies

Mary Croughan, Executive Director, Research Grants Program Office

Kathleen Erwin, Director, Research Program Application and Review Center

- MRUs

UPDATE: Chair Kolaitis presented his summary of the information regarding MRUs and other multicampus research entities and projects (see meeting materials as reference). A discussion of the slides followed.

DISCUSSION: Director Erwin reported that multi-campus research programs (MRPs) were an ad hoc creation not governed by a particular/single policy document and should be considered as another “other” category in the slides. Chair Kolaitis rejoined that the absence of UCOP funding did not remove any legacy programs, regardless of genesis, from academic oversight. It remains unresolved, however, how precisely to govern such legacy programs, especially those whose funding is not directed by UC.

Executive Director Croughan noted that regardless of funding source, the special status of being an MRU must be clear. Members suggested that the Senate’s role should not be focused on funding allocations but on reviewer selection and portfolio scope. Some wondered whether research for the social good should receive protected UCOP funding. Council Chair Simmons posited that two parallel discussions were occurring regarding two distinct potential avenues: an MRU would be an entity with stable 3-5 year renewable funding targeting a school of thought or concept for development, while the other could be a finite project designed to answer a single question. In either case, though, members said, control of access to the “UC” brand must be a Senate priority.

VI. Follow-up Discussion re MRUs

Members

DISCUSSION: Members returned to the topic of how to evaluate and regulate governor’s initiative-type research entities, like the California Institutes for Science and Innovation (Cal ISIs). Similarly, when externally mandated efforts do not receive external funds, UC needs a clear recourse. Members agreed that even if UC cannot defund or disestablish an entity, a portfolio review and academic endorsement was incumbent upon the Senate to devise and promulgate, hopefully in cooperation with the administration.

ACTION: Members should send ideas and suggestions to Vice Chair Crawford in advance of the January meeting.

VII. Campus Updates, New Business and Planning

- External Relations Debrief

ACTION: Analyst Feer will draft and circulate a letter thanking External Relations for the consultation and asking for further information and ongoing relations.

- Campus Updates

UCB: The COR budget was augmented by the Chancellor this year, which will allow for more disciplines to be funded.

UCD: Local discussions continue to focus on animal researcher concerns.

UCI: (Has not met since last update.)

UCLA: Due to an unexpected drop in the number of COR grant applications, the awards and award processes may be changed.

UCM: (No named representative.)

UCR: While the COR grant funds are down again this year, COR solicited a seat at the vetting table for limited-by-campus applications, and received one.

UCSD: (Absent.)

UCSF: COR reviewed its internal grant applications at its last meeting.

UCSB: COR funds are now back to the 06-07 level, following both another central cut and a one-time Chancellor's augmentation.

UCSC: COR is leading efforts to increase campus access to greater computational capacity by developing an MOU with the UCSD supercomputer team.

Adjournment: 4 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Senior Policy Analyst

Attest: Phokion Kolaitis, Chair